

Application No.: 10/721,031
Response dated March 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2004

REMARKS

The Office Action acknowledges that claims 1 - 106 are pending.

Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out the potential statutory double patenting issue in the provisional rejection of paragraph 2. Applicants intend to address this provisional rejection in the other application, but reserve the right to later address the double patenting issue in this application.

The Office Action alleges that claims 1 - 106 are not patentable under sections 102 and 103 over Burnett et al. (U.S. Patent 6,407,211). The Office Action acknowledges that Burnett et al. fails to teach the pH limitations of the independent claims of the subject application. The Office Action argues, however, that a natriuretic peptide, a buffer, an acid, and a base would inherently exhibit a pH value within the pH ranges claimed in the present invention. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

An invention is not anticipated or obvious over the prior if the prior art does not disclose each and every limitation of the claim. There is nothing in the disclosure of Burnett et al. to suggest a solution of natriuretic peptide having a pH of 4.0-6.5, and the Office Action does not provide any evidence to the contrary.

The Office Action also alleges that applicants bear the burden to show patentably distinct differences of the claimed invention to the prior art reference. This is incorrect. The burden of proof shifts to applicants after a *prima facie* showing of anticipation or obviousness has been made. A *prima facie* showing requires that the Office identify prior art disclosing each and every claim limitation. However, here the Office Action admits that the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest the pH limitation. Accordingly, the burden of proof remains on the Patent Office. It is also proper to shift the burden to the applicants where the applicants assert that the claimed invention differs from the prior art in that a parameter of the product is said to differ from that of the prior art when both products are made by identical processes. The processes involved here, however, cannot be shown to be identical at least because the prior art does not disclose the pH of any buffer used.

Finally, the Office asserts that the pH of the prior art solutions is *inherently* the same as those of the claimed invention. This assertion cannot be supported. An invention is not inherently anticipated unless the prior art always and inevitably

Application No.: 10/721,031
Response dated March 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2004

produces the claimed invention. Again, however, there is nothing in Burnett et al. to explicitly teach or reasonably suggest a pH of 4.0 - 6.5 in a relevant solution.

For the foregoing reasons, the subject application is believed to be in good form for allowance. The Examiner is therefore requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert G. Parson, et al.

ABBOTT LABORATORIES
Customer No.: 23492
Telephone: (847) 935-7835
Facsimile: (847) 938-2623


David J. Schmidin
Registration No. 41,294
Attorney for Applicants